

Bradley Wright

From: Jay Donahue [jaydo[REDACTED]net.com]
Sent: Monday, July 07, 2003 10:32 AM
To: Bradley Wright
Subject: Patent Application

Brad,

Following your last email, here are the comments from my technical specialist about the patent application. I am in agreement with all of these comments. Kindly review these comments, and make the changes if you feel that these are appropriate.

Upon reflection, I think it would be best to proceed with the current application on reverse engineering, without (at this point) inclusion of the customization function. We could add customization at a later date as a CIP application.

I am in Denver now, and will call you later this morning. Thank you for your assistance.

Jay

>Envelope-to: [REDACTED]
>From: "R Regan" <rr[REDACTED]org>
>To: "Jay Donahue" <jaydo[REDACTED]net.com>
>Subject: RE: Patent Application
>Date: Sat, 5 Jul 2003 19:44:38 -0400
>X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2911.0)
>Importance: Normal
>
>
>Hi Jay,
>
>There don't appear to be any technical problems with the document. Outside
>of saying that an XML document is used to capture the structure of the
>workflow
>there isn't a lot of technical detail on the matter.
>
>I noticed something that we haven't discussed before is the use of the XML
>document to drive the workflow process. While there aren't any technical
>obstacles in doing this, the current system doesn't work this way.
>
>Some notes/questions by page/section:
>
>fig. 6
>The line from step "changes needed?" Yes to step 601 should have a process
>box "export workflow data structures as tagged document"
>
>pg 9/ sec 47
>The phrase "XML ... document that defines the arrangement of information
>in the file" is very general. It may be better to say the XML document
>defines
>a semantically structured representation of the workflow process and
>deliverable
>document.
>
>pg 9/ sec 48
>The last sentence "When no more changes are needed,... the workflow data
>structure is stored for later use."
>
>In fig. 6 items 603 and 606, the difference between "exported into" and

>"saved" are not clear. In 606 is this really moving to production mode?
>
>Also I'm not sure the use of "export[ed]" is correct. I think bring data
>into
>our system is more of an "import"
>
>pg 11/ sec 55
>I don't understand what functionality the last sentence represents:
> "the system can use software that automatically converts text that
> is not part of the response into a workflow question."
>
>pg 12/ sec 59
>The text in the middle "...and indicate that a yes response would trigger
>the
>answering of the dependent question..."
>
>I think "answering" is confusing, it may be better to say "...trigger the
>inclusion
>of the dependent question in the workflow..."
>
>pg 18/ sec 78
>The 3rd function "convert from development to production" should probably be
>the
>last item.
>
>
>Ron